

**C. REMARKS****Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-7, 9-16, 18-25, and 27 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 10, and 19 are independent claims. Claims 1, 10, and 19 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, and no claims have been added.

**Examiner Interview**

Applicants note with appreciation the telephonic interview conducted between Applicants' representative and the Examiner on July 7, 2006. During the telephonic interview, the Examiner and Applicants' representative discussed differences between Applicants' invention and one of the 103 references (Pfleiger et al., U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0260685). No agreement was reached regarding the claims.

**Drawings**

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's acceptance of Applicants' amended formal drawings filed on January 27, 2006.

**Claim Rejections - Alleged Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1-6, 10-15, and 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuoki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,491, hereinafter "Suzuoki"), an admission of prior art by Applicants, and Pfleiger et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. 2004/0260685, hereinafter "Pfleiger"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants have amended Applicants' independent claim to include limitations of *"wherein each of the data blocks include a plurality of coefficients corresponding to a plurality of*

*linear equations"* and *"the processing resulting in one or more solutions to the plurality of linear equations."* These limitations are described in Applicants' original specification on page 55, lines 15-17 and page 61, lines 11-14, respectively. Therefore, no new matter is added with this amendment

Applicants' independent claims as amended are directed to a system and method of handling data using a plurality of processors with limitations including:

- dividing a common memory, accessible to one or more first processors and to one or more secondary processors, into a plurality of data blocks using one of the first processors, wherein each of the data blocks includes a plurality of coefficients corresponding to a plurality of linear equations, the one or more first processors and the one or more second processors being chosen from a group of heterogeneous processors;
- identifying an available processor from the secondary processors to process one of the data blocks;
- processing the data block using the available secondary processor; and
- processing the data block further using one of the first processors, the processing resulting in one or more solutions corresponding to one or more of the plurality of linear equations.

Applicants solve one or more linear equations by including coefficients corresponding to the plurality of linear equations into data blocks, processing one of the data blocks using a secondary processor, and further processing the data block using a first processor, which results in one or more linear equation solutions.

In contrast, neither Suzuoki nor Pfleiger teach or suggest such limitations. Particularly, Suzuoki focuses on a computer

architecture and programming model for high speed processing over broadband networks, and Pfleiger focuses on querying over multiple data sources. As such, neither Suzuki nor Pfleiger teach or suggest including linear equation coefficients in data blocks, let alone solving the linear equations as claimed by Applicants. In addition, Applicants' admission of prior art also does not teach or suggest such limitations.

Therefore, since Suzuki, Pfleiger, and Applicants' admission of prior art do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination with each other, all of the limitations of Applicants' claim 1 as amended, amended claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claim 10 as amended is an information handling claim including similar limitations of claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable. Claim 19 as amended is a computer program product claim including similar limitations of amended claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable.

Each of the remaining claims 2-6, 11-15, and 20-24 each depend, either directly or indirectly, upon one of the allowable independent claims 1, 10, and 19. Therefore, claims 2-6, 11-15, and 20-24 are each allowable for the same reasons as their respective independent claims.

Claims 7, 16, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki, an admission of prior art by Applicants, Pfleiger, and further in view of Lee et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,724, hereinafter "Lee"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

## PATENT

Claims 7, 16, and 25 each depend, directly or indirectly, upon one of the allowable independent claims 1, 10, and 19 as discussed above. Therefore, claims 7, 16, and 25 are each allowable for the same reasons as their respective independent claims are allowable.

Claims 9, 18, and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuoki, an admission of prior art by Applicants, Pfleiger, and further in view of Proch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,381,659, hereinafter "Proch"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 9, 18, and 27 each depend, directly or indirectly, upon one of the allowable independent claims 1, 10, and 19 as discussed above. Therefore, claims 7, 16, and 25 are each allowable for the same reasons as their respective independent claims are allowable.

Claims 1-6, 10-15, and 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuoki, an admission of prior art by Applicants, and Guttag et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,560,030, hereinafter "Guttag"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

As discussed above, Applicants solve one or more linear equations by dividing coefficients corresponding to the plurality of linear equations into data blocks, processing one of the data blocks using a secondary processor, and further processing the data block using a first processor, which results in one or more linear equation solutions.

In contrast, neither Suzuoki nor Guttag teach or suggest such limitations. Particularly, Suzuoki focuses on a computer architecture and programming model for high speed processing

over broadband networks, and Gutttag discloses a method for image/graphics pixel analysis. As such, neither Suzuoki nor Pfleiger teach or suggest including linear equation coefficients in data blocks, let alone solving the linear equations as claimed by Applicants. In addition, Applicants' admission of prior art also does not teach or suggest such limitations.

Therefore, since Suzuoki, Gutttag, and Applicants' admission of prior art do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination with each other, all of the limitations of Applicants' claim 1 as amended, amended claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claim 10 as amended is an information handling claim including similar limitations of claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable. Claim 19 as amended is a computer program product claim including similar limitations of amended claim 1 and, therefore, is allowable for the same reasons as amended claim 1 is allowable.

#### Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes

PATENT

that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196/  
Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196  
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen  
Attorney for Applicant  
Telephone: (512) 301-6738  
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742